

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00445 01 OF 02 270113Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00
SAJ-01 NSC-05 /065 W
-----270158Z 058535 /66

R 261917Z JAN 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1368
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO CINCLANT
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
USNMR SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0445

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
SUBJECT: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977; INITIAL DRC DISCUSSION JANUARY 25

REF: (A) USNATO 0362 (DTG 211718Z JAN 77), (B) USNATO 0351
(DTG 21604Z JAN 77), (C) USNATO 0363 (DTG 211743Z
JAN 77), (DC) STATE 016137 (DTG 250143Z JAN 77),
(E) 76 USNATO 6741 (DTG 081745Z DEC 76), (F) DPC/D(76)30

SUMMARY: DURING INITIAL DEFENSE REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)
DISCUSSION OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977, DRC AGREED WITH
US SUGGESTION TO FOCUS FIRST ON ISSUES RAISED IN CURRENT
MILITARY APPRECIATION DOCUMENT, AND THEN, THROUGH EXAM-
INATION OF 1975 LONG-RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT, TO TACKLE
RESOURCES AND ALLIANCE COOPERATION SECTIONS. ALL REPS
FAVORED A REVISED, SELF-CONTAINED 1977 MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE
DOCUMENT, AS OPPOSED TO A SUPPLEMENT TO MINISTERIAL
GUIDANCE 1975. INTERNATIONAL STAFF (IS) WILL PREPARE FIRST
DRAFT OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977 FOR FUTURE DRC DISCUSSION.
END SUMMARY.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00445 01 OF 02 270113Z

1. IN OPENING INITIAL DRC DISCUSSION OF MINISTERIAL
GUIDANCE 1977 (REFS A-D), CHAIRMAN (ASYG MUMFORD) CALLED
ATTENTION TO HIS NOTE ON THE SUBJECT (REF A), WHICH PRO-
VIDED A LIST PREPARED BY THE IS OF MAIN THEMES FOR DRC
DISCUSSION. HE ASKED FOR A "FREE-FOR-ALL" DEBATE
AT THE MEETING, WHEREIN HE WOULD MAKE A NOTE OF ALL
THEMES RAISED BY NATIONAL REPS. THIS WOULD ENABLE THE
IS TO PRODUCE A FIRST DRAFT OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977.

2. THE MC REP (CMDRE GELUYCKENS) NOTED THAT THE IMS

LIKED MUMFORD'S LIST OF THEMES, WHICH CONFORMED GENERALLY TO CONCERNS RAISED IN THE MILITARY APPRECIATION. NOTING THAT SEVERAL SECTIONS OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE WOULD HAVE TO BE REWRITTEN (E.G.), THE THREAT, THE LONG-RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT -- WHICH WAS TOO LOW-KEY --RESOURCES, AND THE GUIDANCE PARAGRAPHS THEMSELVES), THE MC REP SAID THAT A REVISED MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT WOULD BE PREFERABLE TO A SUPPLEMENTARY PAPER. THE SHAPE REP (BGEN SCHWEITZER) AGREED THAT MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977 SHOULD BE A SELF-CONTAINED DOCUMENT WHICH COULD STAND ON ITS OWN. HOWEVER, HE ADDED, THE DRC MIGHT USEFULLY FOCUS ITS INITIAL ATTENTION AWAY FROM SUBJECTS WHICH ARE COVERED IN SUCH NATO-AGREED DOCUMENTS AS MC-161 AND MC-14/3 IN ORDER TO DEVOTE APPROPRIATE TIME TO SUCH SECTIONS AS THAT ON RESOURCES.

3. THE CANADIAN REP (MACNAB) SAID THAT THE THEMES SUGGESTED IN ASYG MUMFORD'S NOTE WERE ACCEPTABLE, BUT THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD PREFER THAT THE DRC GIVE CONSIDERATION TO SEVERAL POINTS RAISED IN THE STATEMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE MILITARY COMMITTEE AT THE DECEMBER 1976 DPC MINISTERIAL MEETING. IN PARTICULAR, OTTAWA FAVORED INCLUSION OF ADMIRAL HILL-NORTON'S POINTS ON STRENGTHENING NATO POSTURE BY PROVIDING MORE INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDS AND PURSUING FLEXIBILITY STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS, INCREASING REINFORCEMENT AND RESUPPLY CAPABILITIES, INCREASING SUPPORT

PAGE 03 NATO 00445 01 OF 02 270113Z

CONFIDENTIAL

TO THE FLANKS, AND ATTACKING MAJOR LOGISTIC PROBLEMS THROUGH AN ALLIANCE -WIDE APPROACH. THE CANADIAN REP ADDED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE REACTION OF THE DRC TO THE IDEA OF COMING TO GRIPS WITH THE POOR STATE OF CIVIL EMERGENCY PLANNING IN THE ALLIANCE AND IN MEMBER NATIONS BY FOCUSING ATTENTION ON THE PROBLEM THROUGH REFERENCE IN MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE. FINALLY, THE CANADIAN REP STATED OTTAWA'S PREFERENCE FOR A COMPREHENSIVE REVISED TEXT FOR THE 1977 MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE, AS OPPOSED TO A SUPPLEMENTARY ONE.

4. THE US REP (BADER) SAID THAT, WITHOUT COMMENTING ON THEIR MERITS, THE THEMES PRESENTED IN ASYG MUMFORD'S NOTE (REF A) WAS A BIG BITE TO TAKE INITIALLY. DRAWING FROM REF D, THE US REP SUGGESTED THAT THE DRC BE MORE SELECTIVE AND START ITS DISCUSSIONS OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977 BY REVIEWING THE CURRENT MILITARY APPRECIATION, PARTICULARLY PARAGRAPH 28. THEN, HE CONTINUED, BEFORE CONSIDERING SUBSIDIARY THEMES, THE DRC SHOULD AFFIRM OR REJECT THE MAJOR THEME IN THE 1975 GUIDANCE, THE LONG-RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT. SINCE PARAGRAPH 7 OF THE PRESENT GUIDANCE NOTED THAT NATO COULD MEET THE WARSAW PACT THREAT, PROVIDED ADEQUATE RESOURCES WERE AVAILABLE AND WISELY USED, THIS WOULD LEAD THE DRC NATURALLY TO A DISCUSSION OF WHETHER THE RESOURCE GUIDANCE AND NEW SECTIONS ON ALLIANCE COOPERATION, INCLUDING FLEXIBILITY,

SHOULD BE IMPROVED.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 00445 02 OF 02 270113Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00
SAJ-01 NSC-05 /065 W
-----270216Z 058538 /66

R 261917Z JAN 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1369
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO CINCLANT
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
USNMR SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0445

5. THE US REP'S SUGGESTION QUICKLY GAINED AGREEMENT BY THE UK (PETERS), FRG (BGEN SCHUENEMANN), NETHERLANDS (WYNAENDTS) AND DANISH (BELLING) REPS. THE FRG REP SAID THAT BY STARTING WITH THE MILITARY APPRECIATION, THE DRC WOULD BE LED NATURALLY TO THE MOST IMPORTANT AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION IN MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977. HE AGREED WITH THE SHAPE AND US REPS THAT THE DRC SHOULD FOCUS EARLY ATTENTION ON THE RESOURCES QUESTION, BUT OPINED THAT AGREEMENT ON A NEW RESOURCES FORMULA WOULD BE DIFFICULT AND TRICKY.

6. THE NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES CONTINUED TO BELIEVE THAT THE PRESENTATION OF FORCE PROPOSALS SHOULD BE PRECEDED BY MINISTERIAL DISCUSSION OF ALLIANCE-WIDE SHORTFALLS, AND URGED THAT MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977 CONTAIN A PROVISION TO THAT EFFECT (REF E AND F). HE REITERATED THAT THE DUTCH PROPOSAL IS IN CONSONANCE WITH DPC/D(71)10 PROCEDURES AND PARA 28 OF THE MILITARY APPRECIATION, AND, COMMENTING THAT SHAPE SEEMED RELUCTANT TO PROVIDE A STATEMENT OF FORCE REQUIREMENTS, RHETORICALLY ASKED HOW CAN MINISTERS JUSTIFY NATO FORCE GOALS TO THEIR
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00445 02 OF 02 270113Z

GOVERNMENTS IF THE NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES (NMAS) CANNOT PROVIDE A LOGICAL BASIS FOR THESE FORCE GOALS BY IDENTIFYING CLEARLY FORCE REQUIREMENTS AND THE MAJOR AREAS OF ALLIANCE DEFICIENCY IN MEETING THESE REQUIREMENTS. THE SHAPE REP RESPONDED THAT, IN CONTRAST TO SACLANT, WHO HAS A RELATIVELY LESS COMPLEX MISSION, AND THUS CAN COME UP WITH A REQUIREMENTS STATEMENT, SACEUR'S FAR MORE COMPLEX AND VARIED

MISSIONS INHIBIT SUCH AN APPROACH. SHOULD SACEUR PRODUCE A COMPREHENSIVE STATEMENT OF FORCES REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH HIS MANY DEFENSE MISSIONS, THE RESULT COULD BE AN UNREALISTIC "LISBON GOALS" TYPE SET OF REQUIREMENTS WHICH WOULD BE POLITICALLY COUNTERPRODUCTIVE. SACLANT REP (CMDRE COTE), NOTHING THAT THERE HAS BEEN AN EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN GENERAL HAIG AND ADM. KIDD ON THIS ISSUE, STATED THAT ALTHOUGH SACLANT FORCE PROPOSALS ARE BASED UPON STATED FORCE REQUIREMENTS, SACLANT WOULD NOT SUPPORT REQUIRING SACEUR TO DO THE SAME.

7. MUMFORD SUGGESTED THAT THE DUTCH CONCERNS MIGHT BE MET IF THE NMAS WOULD, AT APPROPRIATE TIMES DURING THEIR PREPARATION OF FORCE PROPOSALS, MAKE PRESENTATIONS TO THE DEFENSE PLANNING COMMITTEE SETTING FORTH THE REASONING AND PROCEDURES THAT LIE BEHIND THESE PROPOSALS, COMMENTING THAT DPC/D(71)10, PARA 15 CONTAINS A PROVISION TO THIS EFFECT. THE DUTCH REP RESPONDED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES ARE INTERESTED PRIMARILY IN THE RATIONALE BEHIND NMA FORCE PROPOSALS AND ARE QUITE FLEXIBLE REGARDING THE FORMAT FOR AN ASSESSMENT OF SHORT-FALLS.

8. REFERRING TO THE SPECIFIC THEMES OUTLINED IN REF A, FRG REP, ON A PERSONAL BASIS, STATED THAT BY SEPARATING NUCLEAR POSTURE, SUBPPARA (2), FROM CONVENTIONAL FORCES, SUBPARA (1), THE CHAIRMAN'S NOTE GAVE THE IMPRESSION OF DECOUPLING ELEMENTS OF THE TRIAD, WHICH HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD FIND UNACCEPTABLE. MUMFORD RESPONDED THAT THE SERIAL LISTING OF THEMES IN HIS NOTE DID NOT IMPLY ANY DECOUPLING

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00445 02 OF 02 270113Z

OF CONVENTIONAL AND NUCLEAR FORCES.

9. IN SUMMARIZING THE DISCUSSION, MUMFORD STATED THAT (A) HE DID NOT SEE ANY SUBSTANTIVE CONFLICT BETWEEN HIS THEMES AND THE INITIALLY MORE LIMITED PROCEDURAL APPROACH SUGGESTED BY THE US; (B) A CONSENSUS IN FAVOR OF A SHORTER, SELF-CONTAINED DOCUMENT HAD EMERGED; AND (C) BASED ON THE ABOVE, THE IS WILL PREPARE A FIRST DRAFT OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977 FOR FUTURE DRC DISCUSSION.

COMMENT: THOUGH THE IS ACCEPTED THE US PROCEDURAL PROPOSAL TO FOCUS THE DRC DISCUSSION INITIALLY ALONG THE LINES OF REF D, MUMFORD NONETHELESS INTENDS TO PRODUCE A FIRST DRAFT COVERING ALL THE POINTS IDENTIFIED IN HIS PAPER TO SERVE AS A BASIS FOR SUBSEQUENT DRC DISCUSSIONS. END COMMENT.

STRAUSZ-HUPE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 30-Aug-1999 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 26-Jan-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977NATO00445
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: n/a
Format: TEL
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770191/baaabbln.tel
Line Count: 216
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Message ID: 659484de-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 0362 (DTG 211718Z JAN 77), (B) USNATO 0351 (DTG 21604Z JAN 77), (C) USNATO 0363 (DTG 211743Z JAN 77), (DC) STATE 016137 (DTG 250143Z JAN 77), (E) 76 USNATO 6741 (DTG 081745Z DEC 76), (F) DPC/D(76)30
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29-Sep-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3680912
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977; INITIAL DRC DISCUSSION JANUARY 25
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
To: STATE SECDEF MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/659484de-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009